

Direct design of LPV feedback controllers: technical details, proofs and a numerical example

Carlo Novara *

Abstract

The paper contains technical details and proofs of recent results developed by the author, regarding the design of LPV controllers directly from experimental data. A numerical example is also presented, about control of the Duffing oscillator.

1 Introduction

Consider a discrete-time LPV (Linear Parameter-Varying) system S in state-space form:

$$x_{t+1} = A(p_t) x_t + B(p_t) u_t + H(p_t) e_t \quad (1)$$

where $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the time, $x_t \in X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_x}$ is the state, $p_t \in P \subset \mathbb{R}^{n_p}$ is the time-varying parameter, $u_t \in U \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is the input, and $e_t \in E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_e}$ is a noise including both process and measurement disturbances (see the Appendix). P and E are compact sets. A , B and H are matrices/vectors of suitable dimensions. B and H are Lipschitz continuous functions of $p \in P$.

This manuscript contains technical details and proofs of recent results developed by the author, regarding the direct design of LPV controllers for systems of the form (1) from experimental data. A numerical example is also presented, about control of the Duffing oscillator, a two-order system which, for certain input signals, may display a chaotic behavior.

2 Problem formulation

Suppose that the matrices A , B and H in (1) are unknown, but a set of measurements is available:

$$\mathcal{D} \doteq \{\tilde{p}_k, \tilde{x}_k, \tilde{u}_k\}_{k=-L}^{-1} \quad (2)$$

*Dipartimento di Automatica e Informatica, Politecnico di Torino, Italy. E-mail: carlo.novara@polito.it.

where $\tilde{x}_k = x_k$ is the measured state (including process and measurement noises), $\tilde{u}_k$ is the noise-corrupted measurement of u_k and $\tilde{p}_k = p_k$ is the measured scheduling vector. For simplicity but without loss of generality, p_k is assumed to be noise-free (supposing a noise-corrupted p_k would lead to the same results, at the expense of an heavier notation). $\tilde{p}_k$, $\tilde{x}_k$ and $\tilde{u}_k$ are assumed bounded for all $k = -L, \dots, -1$.

Consider the control system of Figure 1, where S is the LPV system (1) and the controllers K_1 and K_2 are vectors of the form

$$\begin{aligned} K_1(p_t) &= (K_{11}(p_t), \dots, K_{1n_x}(p_t)) \\ K_2(p_t) &= (K_{21}(p_t), \dots, K_{2n_x}(p_t)). \end{aligned}$$

These vectors are functions of the scheduling parameter p_t ; the output of the block K_1 in Figure 1 is given by $K_1(p_t) r_{t+1}$; the output of the block K_2 is given by $K_2(p_t) x_t$. The notation Kx is used to indicate the dot product between the vectors K and x .

The problem is to design a controller $K(p_t) \doteq (K_1(p_t), K_2(p_t))$ ensuring a "small" tracking error $\|r_t - x_t\|_\infty$. A "low" complexity controller is looked for, allowing an efficient on-line implementation in real-world applications.




Figure 1: Feedback control system.

In order to formulate more precisely this problem, define the following *point-wise inversion error*:

$$IE(K, p, r, x, e) \doteq \|r - (A(p) - B(p) K_2(p)) x - B(p) K_1(p) r - H(p) e\|_\infty \quad (3)$$

where $p \in P$, $(r, x) \in X^2$, $e \in E$, and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is the vector ℓ_∞ norm. Thus, define *global inversion error* as

$$GIE(K) \doteq \|IE(K, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{L_\infty}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{L_\infty}$ is the functional L_∞ norm evaluated over the IE domain $P \times X^2 \times E$.

The following stability notion can also be introduced (for simplicity but without loss of generality, zero initial conditions are assumed in the remainder of the paper).

Definition 1 An LPV system with state x_t , input u_t , parameter p_t , and noise e_t is input-to-state ℓ_∞ stable if, some $\lambda_u < \infty$ and $\lambda_e < \infty$ exist such that the state sequence $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$ is bounded as

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq \lambda_u \|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty + \lambda_e \|\mathbf{e}\|_\infty$$

for any input sequence $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots) \in \ell_\infty$, any noise sequence $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, \dots) \in \ell_\infty$, any parameter sequence $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots) \in \ell_\infty$ with $p_t \in P, \forall t$. ■

Consider now that the closed-loop system in Figure 1 is described by the difference equation

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} = & (A(p_t) - B(p_t) K_2(p_t)) x_t \\ & + B(p_t) K_1(p_t) r_{t+1} + H(p_t) e_t. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Stabilizability is defined as follows.

Definition 2 The LPV system (1) is γ -stabilizable if a $\gamma < \infty$ and a function $K_2 \in \mathcal{F}(\gamma, P)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\gamma, P) \doteq & \{f : \|f(0)\|_\infty < \infty, \\ & \|f(p) - f(\hat{p})\|_\infty \leq \gamma \|p - \hat{p}\|_\infty, \forall p, \hat{p} \in P\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

exist such that the closed-loop system (4) is input-to-state ℓ_∞ stable. ■

Assumption 1 The LPV system (1) is γ_o -stabilizable, for some $\gamma_o < \infty$. ■

Definition 3 A function $K^o = (K_1^o, K_2^o)$ is an optimal controller for the system (1) if

$$K^o = \arg \min_{K \in \mathcal{K}_s \cap \mathcal{F}(\gamma_o, P)} GIE(K). \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{K}_s$ is the set of all stabilizing controllers. ■

An optimal controller K^o is thus a right-inverse function which, among all functions stabilizing the closed-loop system, gives the minimum global inversion error. Clearly, such a controller is not known since, as assumed above, the system (1) is not known (even for known system, the evaluation of K^o from (6) is in general hard).

In this paper, an approach is proposed, called *Direct FeedbackK (DFK) design*, that uses an approximation of K^o , identified from the available data (2), as the controller K in the closed-loop system of Figure 1. This approximation is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{K} &= (\hat{K}_1, \hat{K}_2) \\ \hat{K}_1(p_t) &= (\hat{K}_{11}(p_t), \dots, \hat{K}_{1n_x}(p_t)) \\ \hat{K}_2(p_t) &= (\hat{K}_{21}(p_t), \dots, \hat{K}_{2n_x}(p_t)) \\ \hat{K}_{jl}(p_t) &= \sum_{i=1}^m a_{jli} \phi_i(p_t) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\phi_i : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are Lipschitz continuous basis functions and $a_{jli} \in \mathbb{R}$, $j = 1, 2$, $l = 1, \dots, n_x$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. The vector $a = (a_{jli}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, with $N \doteq 2n_x m$, containing all the coefficients a_{jli} is required to be sparse, i.e. to have a “small” number of non-zero components. The main reason for this requirement is that vector sparsity allows an efficient implementation on real-time processors, which may have limited memory and computational capacity. Moreover, sparse approximations are known to enjoy nice regularization properties, providing good accuracy on new data and limiting well-known issues such as over-fitting and the curse of dimensionality.

The following problem is investigated in this paper.

Problem 1 *From the available data (2), identify an approximation (7) of the optimal controller K^o such that:*

- (i) *The feedback system of Fig. 1 is input-to-state ℓ_∞ stable.*
- (ii) *The vector $a = (a_{jli}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is sparse. More precisely: the vector a has a minimal ℓ_1 quasi-norm.*
- (iii) *The tracking error*

$$TE_t(K) \doteq \|r_t - x_t\|_\infty$$

is “small” for all $t = 0, 1, \dots$. ■

3 Closed-loop stability analysis

In this section, a theoretical result about stability of DFK control systems is derived. This result will be used by the identification Algorithm 1 in Section 4, in order to obtain a controller stabilizing the DFK closed-loop system.

Define the following *residue function*:

$$\Delta(p_t) \doteq K^o(p_t) - \widehat{K}(p_t) \quad (8)$$

where K^o is an optimal controller (see Definition 3) and $\widehat{K}$ is an approximated controller. Considering that $\widehat{K}$ and K^o are Lipschitz continuous by definition, we have that Δ is also Lipschitz continuous. Since P is a bounded set, it follows that

$$\lambda_2 \doteq \max_{p \in P} \|\Delta_2(p)\|_1 < \infty \quad (9)$$

where $\Delta_2(p_t) \doteq K_2^o(p_t) - \widehat{K}_2(p_t)$ and $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the ℓ_1 vector norm. Analogously, we have that

$$\lambda_B \doteq \max_{p \in P} \|B(p)\|_\infty < \infty \quad (10)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is the ℓ_∞ vector norm.

Consider now that the closed-loop system (4) with $K = K^o$ is input-to-state ℓ_∞ stable by assumption. Thus, some $\lambda_S < \infty$ and $\lambda_e < \infty$ exist such that the state sequence $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$ is bounded as

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq \lambda_S \|\mathbf{r}\|_\infty + \lambda_e \|\mathbf{e}\|_\infty$$

for any reference sequence $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots) \in \ell_\infty$, any noise sequence $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, \dots) \in \ell_\infty$, any parameter sequence $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots) \in \ell_\infty$ with $p_t \in P$, $\forall t$.

The following result gives sufficient conditions for the stability of the DFK control scheme of Figure 1 with $K = \hat{K}$ and provides a tight bound on the related tracking error. Tightness is here intended in a worst-case sense: we say that a bound on a variable is tight when the variable, in the worst possible case, hits the bound.

Theorem 1 *Let Assumption 1 hold. If*

$$\lambda_2 < 1/\lambda_S, \quad (11)$$

then:

- (i) *The DFK closed-loop system (4) with $K = \hat{K}$ is input-to-state ℓ_∞ stable.*
- (ii) *The DFK closed-loop system tracking error is tightly bounded as*

$$TE_t(\hat{K}) \leq IE(K^o, w_{t-1}, e_{t-1}) + \lambda_B |\Delta(w_{t-1})| \quad (12)$$

for all $t = 0, 1, \dots$, where $w_t \doteq (p_t, r_{t+1}, x_t)$ and $\Delta(w_t) \doteq \Delta(p_t)(r_{t+1}, -x_t)$.

Proof. See the Appendix. ■

4 DFK control design

4.1 Available prior and experimental information

In this subsection, the information available for control design is summarized.

Experimental information. The data (2) have been collected, which can be conveniently described as

$$\tilde{u}_k = K^o(\tilde{w}_k) + d_k, \quad k = -L, \dots, -1 \quad (13)$$

where K^o is the unknown optimal controller (see Definition 3), $\tilde{w}_k \doteq (\tilde{p}_k, \tilde{x}_{k+1}, \tilde{x}_k)$, $K^o(\tilde{w}_k) \equiv K^o(\tilde{p}_k, \tilde{x}_{k+1}, \tilde{x}_k) \doteq K^o(\tilde{p}_k)(\tilde{x}_{k+1}, -\tilde{x}_k)$, and d_k accounts for the noise corrupting u_k and for the fact that K^o is not an exact right-inverse of the function defining the system (see the Appendix). Note that, in the data used for design, the reference is replaced by the state at time $t + 1$. ■

Prior information on the noise d_k . Since the measurements $\tilde{u}_k$ and $\tilde{w}_k$ are bounded and $K^o \in \mathcal{F}(\gamma_o, P)$, where $K^o \equiv K^o(w_t) \doteq K^o(p_t)(r_{t+1}, -x_t)$, $w_t \doteq (p_t, r_{t+1}, x_t)$, it follows that the noise d_k is bounded:

$$|d_k| \leq \delta, \quad k = -L, \dots, -1 \quad (14)$$

for some $\delta < \infty$. ■

Prior information on the function Δ . The function $\Delta(w_t) \doteq \Delta(p_t)(r_{t+1}, -x_t)$ is Lipschitz continuous:

$$\Delta \in \mathcal{F}(\gamma_\Delta, \Omega_\Delta) \quad (15)$$

for some $\gamma_\Delta < \infty$, where $\Omega_\Delta \doteq P \times X^2$. This directly follows from (8) and from the Lipschitz continuity of K^o and $\hat{K}$. ■

4.2 DFK design algorithm

Based on the stability Theorem 1, an algorithm is proposed in this subsection, for the direct design of LPV controllers allowing us to satisfy the three requirements of Problem 1.

Consider a set of Lipschitz continuous basis functions ϕ_i , $i = 1, \dots, m$. The choice of these functions can be carried out considering the numerous options available in the literature (e.g. Gaussian, sigmoidal, wavelet, polynomial, trigonometric, ...). Define the matrix $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times N}$, $N \doteq 2n_x m$, as follows:

$$\Psi \doteq \begin{bmatrix} -Z_{01}\Phi & \cdots & -Z_{0n_x}\Phi & Z_{11}\Phi & \cdots & Z_{1n_x}\Phi \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$

where $Z_{ji} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times L}$ and $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times m}$ are given by

$$Z_{ji} \doteq \text{diag} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}_{i,j+1} & \cdots & \tilde{x}_{i,j+L} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ \Phi \doteq \begin{bmatrix} \phi_1(\tilde{p}_1) & \cdots & \phi_m(\tilde{p}_1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \phi_1(\tilde{p}_L) & \cdots & \phi_m(\tilde{p}_L) \end{bmatrix},$$

$\tilde{x}_{i,t}$ indicates the i th component of $\tilde{x}_t$ and $j = 0, 1$. Define the sets of indices

$$Q_\zeta^k \doteq \{i : \|(\tilde{p}_k, \tilde{x}_{k+1}) - (\tilde{p}_i, \tilde{x}_{i+1})\|_\infty \leq \zeta\}$$

where $k = -L, \dots, -1$ and ζ is the minimum value for which every index set Q_ζ^k contains at least two elements.

Algorithm 1

1. Estimate δ and λ_S by means of the validation procedure in [4] from the data set (2).
2. Choose $\lambda_2^s < 1/\lambda_S$.
3. Solve the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} b^* &= \arg \min_{b \in \mathbb{R}^N} \|b\|_1 \\ \text{subject to} \\ (a) \quad &\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}} - \Psi b\|_\infty \leq \delta \\ (b) \quad &|\tilde{u}_l - \tilde{u}_k + (\Psi_k - \Psi_l)b| \leq \lambda_2^s \|\tilde{x}_l - \tilde{x}_k\|_\infty + 2\delta, \\ &k = -L, \dots, -1, l \in Q_\zeta^k \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \doteq (\tilde{u}_{-L}, \dots, \tilde{u}_{-1})$ and Ψ_k denotes the k th row of the matrix Ψ . ■

The DFK controller is $K^*(p_t) \doteq (K_1^*(p_t), K_2^*(p_t))$, where

$$\begin{aligned} K_1^*(p_t) &= (K_{11}^*(p_t), \dots, K_{1n_x}^*(p_t)) \\ K_2^*(p_t) &= (K_{21}^*(p_t), \dots, K_{2n_x}^*(p_t)) \\ K_{jl}^*(p_t) &= \sum_{i=1}^m a_{jli}^* \phi_i(p_t) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

and $a_{jli}^* = b_{(j-1)n_x m + (l-1)m + i}^*$. ■

4.3 Asymptotic stability property

A result is now presented, showing that the controller K^* identified by Algorithm 1 satisfies the stability condition (11) when the number of data L tends to infinity. The following assumption is needed to prove this result.

Assumption 2 *The set of points $\mathcal{D}_{wd}^L \doteq \{(\tilde{w}_k, d_k)\}_{k=-L}^{-1}$ is dense on $\Omega_\Delta \times \mathcal{B}_\delta$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$, where $\mathcal{B}_\delta \doteq \{d \in \mathbb{R} : |d| \leq \delta\}$. That is, for any pair $(w, d) \in \Omega_\Delta \times \mathcal{B}_\delta$ and any $\lambda > 0$, a $L_\lambda < \infty$ and a pair $(\tilde{w}_k, d_k) \in \mathcal{D}_{wd}^{L_\lambda}$ exist such that $\|(y, d) - (\tilde{w}_k, d_k)\|_\infty \leq \lambda$. ■*

Assumption 2 essentially ensures that the controller domain Ω_Δ is “well explored” by the data $\tilde{w}_k$ and, at the same time, the noise d_k covers its domain $\mathcal{B}_\delta$, hitting the bounds $-\delta$ and δ with arbitrary closeness after a sufficiently long time. This latter noise property is called tightness, see [5] and, for a probabilistic version, [1].

Theorem 2 *Let the optimization problem (17) be feasible for any $L > 0$. Let Assumption 2 holds. Then, $\max_{p \in P} \|\Delta_2(p)\|_1 = \lambda_2$, where*

$$\limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_2^s < 1/\lambda_S. \quad (19)$$

Proof. See the Appendix. ■

4.4 Set Membership optimality analysis

From the information summarized in Subsection 4.1, we have that $K^o \in FIFS$, where $FIFS$ is the *Feasible Inverse Function Set*, defined as

$$FIFS \doteq \{K = \hat{K} + \Delta : \Delta \in \mathcal{F}(\gamma_\Delta, \Omega_\Delta), \\ |\tilde{u}_k - K(\tilde{w}_k)| \leq \delta, k = -L, \dots, -1\}.$$

According to this definition, $FIFS$ is the set of all inverse functions consistent with the prior and experimental information. Hence, the tightest bound on $|\Delta(w_{t-1})| = |K^o(w_{t-1}) - \hat{K}(w_{t-1})|$ which can be derived on the basis of this information is given by $\sup_{K \in FIFS} |K^o(w_{t-1}) - \hat{K}(w_{t-1})|$, leading to the following definition of *worst-case tracking error*:

$$WE_t(\hat{K}) \doteq IE(K^o, w_{t-1}, e_{t-1}) + \lambda_B AE_t(\hat{K}) \quad (20)$$

where

$$AE_t(\hat{K}) \doteq \sup_{K \in FIFS} |K(w_{t-1}) - \hat{K}(w_{t-1})|$$

is called the *worst-case approximation error*. An optimal DFK controller is defined as an inverse function K^{op} which guarantees the closed-loop stability and minimizes the worst-case approximation error. However, finding an optimal

DFK controller may be hard or not convenient from a computational point of view, and sub-optimal solutions can be looked for. In particular, approximations that guarantee a degradation of at most 2 are often considered in the literature. These approximations are called almost-optimal [7], [3].

Definition 4 *An inverse function K^{ao} is an almost-optimal DFK controller if:*

- (i) $\max_{p_t \in P} \|K_2^o(p_t) - K_2^{ao}(p_t)\|_1 < 1/\lambda_S$.
- (ii) $AE_t(K^{ao}) \leq 2 \inf_K AE_t(K)$, for all $t = 0, 1, \dots$. ■

The following theorem shows that, provided the closed-loop stability (which can be guaranteed when the number of data is large, see Theorem 2), the controller K^* identified by means of Algorithm 1 is almost-optimal.

Theorem 3 *Let the optimization problem (17) be feasible. Let Assumption 1 holds. Assume also that*

$$\max_{p \in P} \|K_2^o(p_t) - K_2^{ao}(p_t)\|_1 < 1/\lambda_S \quad (21)$$

Then, the DFK controller K^* is almost-optimal.

Proof. See the Appendix. ■

5 Example: control of the Duffing oscillator

The Duffing system is a second-order damped oscillator with nonlinear spring, described by the following differential equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= x_2 \\ \dot{x}_2 &= -\alpha_1 x_1 - \alpha_2 x_1^3 - \beta x_2 + u \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $x = (x_1, x_2)$ is the system state (x_1 and x_2 are the oscillator position and velocity, respectively) and u is the input. The following values of the parameters have been considered: $\alpha_1 = 1$, $\alpha_2 = -1$, $\beta = 0.2$. For these parameter values and for certain choices of the input signal, this system exhibits a chaotic behavior, and this makes control design a particularly challenging problem. Note that this is a nonlinear system which can be seen as a quasi-LPV system, according to the definition given in [6].

A simulation of the Duffing system (22) having duration 200 s has been performed, using the input signal $u(\tau) = 0.4 \sin(\tau)$ (τ here denotes the continuous time). A set of $L = 2000$ data have been collected from this simulation with a sampling period $T_s = 0.1$ s:

$$\mathcal{D} \doteq \{\tilde{p}_k, \tilde{x}_k, \tilde{u}_k\}_{k=-2000}^{-1}$$

where $\tilde{u}_k$ are the measurements of the input, $\tilde{x}_k$ are the measurements of the state, corrupted by a zero-mean Gaussian noise having a noise-to-signal standard deviation ratio of 0.05, and the scheduling parameter is $\tilde{p}_t = \tilde{x}_t$.

A set of $m = 28$ polynomial basis functions has been considered:

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_1(p) &= 1, \phi_2(p) = p_1, \phi_3(p) = p_2, \\ \phi_4(p) &= p_1^2, \phi_5(p) = p_1 p_2, \phi_6(p) = p_2^2, \\ \dots, \phi_{27}(p) &= p_1 p_2^5, \phi_{28}(p) = p_2^6.\end{aligned}$$

The matrix Ψ has been constructed according to (16). Note that the total number of basis functions used in the matrix Ψ is $N = 4m = 112$. Then, Algorithm 1 has been applied: The bound δ in (14) has been estimated (together with the Lipschitz constant γ_Δ) from the data set $\mathcal{D}$ by means of the validation procedure in [4], suitably adapted for the present LPV case. The bound λ_B in (11) has also been estimated from the data set $\mathcal{D}$, using a similar adaption of the procedure in [4]. The optimization problem in Algorithm 1 has been solved using the CVX toolbox [2]. A controller $K^{*,1} = (K_1^{*,1}, K_2^{*,1})$ of the form (18) has been obtained.

In order to verify the generalization capability of the controller, a validation test has been carried out. A new set of data has been generated by performing a simulation of the Duffing system (22) with duration 200 s (corresponding to 2000 data). In this simulation, an input signal different from the one of the design data set has been considered. In particular, the input used for the validation data is $u(\tau) = 0.3 \sin(0.5\tau) + \xi_G(\tau)$, where $\xi_G(\tau)$ is a white Gaussian noise with zero mean and standard deviation 0.3. The controller has been simulated on both the design and validation data and, for each of these two simulations, the $RMS(\tilde{u}_t - \hat{u}_t)$ index has been computed, where $\tilde{u}_t$ is the measured input, $\hat{u}_t$ is the input provided by the controller and $RMS(z_t) \doteq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2000} \sum_{t=0}^{1999} z_t^2}$. The RMS values 0.0903 and 0.1094 have been obtained on the design and validation set, respectively. The RMS value obtained on the validation set is thus very similar to that obtained on the design set, indicating that the controller is able to provide the correct command input also for trajectories different from those used for its design. Obviously, this does not guarantee closed-loop stability.

Note that verifying theoretically the stabilizability assumption (11) is not easy in general. What can be done in practice is checking this assumption on the measured data, first estimating λ_S by means of the validation procedure in [4], then checking if Lipschitz continuous basis functions and a $\lambda_2^s < 1/\lambda_S$ exist for which the optimization problem of Algorithm 1 is feasible. This numerical verification has been performed in this example and the considered system resulted to be stabilizable.

The DFK control scheme of Figure 1 has then been implemented, where S is the system (22) (including D/A and A/D converters, the former preceding, the latter following the system), $K_1 = K_1^{*,1}$, $K_2 = K_2^{*,1}$, and e_t is a Gaussian noise affecting the state measurements, having zero-mean and a noise-to-signal standard deviation ratio of 0.05. A simulation of the DFK control system with duration 200 s has been performed, using zero initial conditions and a reference signal r_t with first component (the oscillator position) generated as a uniform noise with amplitude 5, filtered by a second-order filter with a cutoff frequency of 1 rad/s (this filter has been inserted in order to ensure not too high varia-

tions). The second component (the oscillator velocity) has been generated as the derivative of the first. In Figure 2, the two states are compared to their respective references for a portion of the simulation time interval.

A second DFK controller, called $K^{*,2}$, has been designed using the scheduling variable $\tilde{p}_t = \tilde{x}_{1,t}^2$, where $\tilde{x}_{1,t}$ is the first component of the measured state vector $\tilde{x}_t$. Indeed, with this choice, the Duffing system (22) becomes a “true” LPV system. This design has been performed by means of Algorithm 1, using polynomial basis functions (up to the 6th degree) and the same data set and procedure employed for the design of the first controller.

A third DFK controller, called $K^{*,3}$, has been also designed, assuming that the full state is not available but only the output $\tilde{y}_t = \tilde{x}_{1,t}$ can be measured. Feedback has been performed from the regressor $(\tilde{y}_t, \tilde{y}_{t-1})$ and the scheduling variable has been chosen as $\tilde{p}_t = (\tilde{y}_t, \tilde{y}_{t-1})$. This design has been carried out by means of Algorithm 1, using polynomial basis functions (up to the 6th degree) and the same data set and procedure employed for the design of the other two controllers. For $K^{*,3}$, the second component of the reference has been taken as the delayed first component. Note that, for $K^{*,3}$, tracking regards only the output $\tilde{y}_t$, i.e. the first state component.

Then, a Monte Carlo (MC) simulation has been carried out, where this data-generation-control-design procedure has been repeated 100 times. For each trial, the tracking performance has been evaluated by means of the Root Mean Square tracking errors $RMS_i = RMS(r_{i,t} - x_{i,t})$, where i indicates the i th vector component and $RMS(z_t) \doteq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2000} \sum_{t=0}^{1999} z_t^2}$. The averages $\overline{RMS}_i$ of these errors obtained in the MC simulation are reported in Table 1, together with the average number $\bar{N}^{sel}$ of basis functions selected by Algorithm 1. From these results, it can be concluded that all the DFK controllers are able to ensure an accurate tracking, even in the presence of quite high measurement noises, using a small number of basis functions.

In order to study the behavior of a DFK control system in function of the used basis functions, further trials have been performed, relaxing the constraints in (17) (i.e. increasing δ). The setting used for the controller $K^{*,1}$ has been considered in these trials. The obtained results can be summarized as follows: with 21 basis functions, a deterioration of the RMS tracking errors of about 2 times has been observed; with 17 basis functions, a deterioration of the RMS tracking errors of about 5 times has been observed; with 5 basis functions, the controller was still able to stabilize the closed-loop system but the actual state was completely different from the reference.

Note that the control design procedure is very simple (in all the three cases), not requiring to identify an LTI model for each working condition as in gain-scheduling or to solve an optimization problem at each time step as in predictive control. In the DFK approach, the controller is designed just solving off-line a convex optimization problem, using directly the measured data. The resulting controllers are also extremely simple: only a few basis functions are used to control the system over its whole domain.

	$K^{*,1}$	$K^{*,2}$	$K^{*,3}$
N^{sel}	27	26	27
$\overline{RMS}_1$	0.0562	0.0723	0.0534
$\overline{RMS}_2$	0.0859	0.1792	-

Table 1: Average number of selected basis function and average RMS tracking errors.




Figure 2: Tracking performance of controller $K^{*,1}$. Above: oscillator position. Below: oscillator velocity. Continuous (black) line: reference. Dashed (red) line: state.

6 Appendix

Noise in (1). Consider an LPV system in state-space form, including also the measurement equation:

$$\begin{aligned} z_{t+1} &= A(p_t) z_t + B(p_t) u_t + Q(p_t) \xi_t^p \\ x_t &= z_t + \xi_t^m \end{aligned}$$

where z_t is the state, x_t is the measured state, u_t is the input, p_t is the scheduling parameter vector, ξ_t^p is a process disturbance and ξ_t^m is a measurement noise. Taking z_{t+1} from the first equation and replacing it in the second one (with $t \rightarrow t+1$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_{t+1} &= A(p_t) z_t + B(p_t) u_t + Q(p_t) \xi_t^p + \xi_{t+1}^m \\ &= A(p_t) x_t + B(p_t) u_t + Q(p_t) \xi_t^p + \xi_{t+1}^m - A(p_t) \xi_t^m. \end{aligned}$$

Posing

$$H(p_t) = [Q(p_t), I, -A(p_t)]$$

$$e_t = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_t^p \\ \xi_{t+1}^m \\ \xi_t^m \end{bmatrix},$$

we obtain the state equation

$$x_{t+1} = A(p_t)x_t + B(p_t)u_t + H(p_t)e_t$$

where e_t includes both process and measurement disturbances. $\blacksquare$

Noise in (13). According to the state equation, u_t is the input value that, for given p_t , x_t and e_t , yields the value x_{t+1} of the state at time $t+1$. On the other hand, the optimal controller K^o provides, for $r_{t+1} = x_{t+1}$, an input value u_t^o given by

$$u_t^o = K^o(p_t, x_{t+1}, x_t).$$

If K^o is an exact right-inverse of g , then $u_t = u_t^o$. Otherwise, $u_t = u_t^o + \xi_t^o$ where ξ_t^o is an error due to the fact that K^o is not an exact right-inverse of the function defining the LPV system.

Suppose that a set of noise-corrupted measurements is available:

$$\mathcal{D} \doteq \{\tilde{p}_k, \tilde{x}_k, \tilde{u}_k\}_{k=1}^L$$

where $\tilde{u}_t = u_t + \xi_t^u$ is the measured input, ξ_t^u is a measurement noise, $\tilde{x}_k = x_k$ (note that x_k is already the measured state, including process and measurement noises) and $\tilde{p}_k = p_k$ is the measured scheduling vector (for simplicity but without loss of generality, p_k is assumed to be noise-free). Then, we can write the above equation (i.e. $u_t^o = K^o(p_t, x_{t+1}, x_t)$) as

$$\tilde{u}_t = K^o(\tilde{p}_t, \tilde{x}_{t+1}, \tilde{x}_t) + \xi_t^o + \xi_t^u = K^o(\tilde{w}_t) + d_t$$

where $\tilde{w}_t = (\tilde{p}_t, \tilde{x}_{t+1}, \tilde{x}_t)$ and $d_t = \xi_t^o + \xi_t^u$. From this equation, we can see that d_t accounts for the noise corrupting u_t and for the fact that K^o is not an exact right-inverse of the function defining the LPV system. The noise e_t is implicitly taken into account in the argument of the controller. $\blacksquare$

Proof of Theorem 1. (i) Consider that the closed-loop system (4) can be written as

$$x_{t+1} = G^o(p_t)x_t + B(p_t)\Delta_2(p_t)x_t + B(p_t)\hat{K}_1(p_t)r_{t+1} + H(p_t)e_t \quad (23)$$

where

$$G^o(p_t) \doteq A(p_t) - B(p_t)K_2^o(p_t)$$

$$\Delta_2(p_t) \doteq K_2^o(p_t) - \hat{K}_2(p_t). \quad (24)$$

This shows that the system in Figure 1 is equivalent to the system in Figure 3 where $K \rightarrow \hat{K}$, and q^{-1} is the time-shift operator: $q^{-1}x_{t+1} = x_t$.

By Assumption 1, the internal closed-loop system corresponding to the block diagram inside the dashed line in Figure 3 defined by

$$x_{t+1} = G^o(p_t)x_t + B(p_t)\hat{r}_{t+1} + H(p_t)e_t \quad (25)$$

is input-to-state ℓ_∞ stable. Moreover, the state sequence $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$ of the closed-loop system inside the dashed line in Figure 3 is bounded as

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq \lambda_S \|\mathbf{r}\|_\infty + \lambda_e \|\mathbf{e}\|_\infty \quad (26)$$

for some $\lambda_S < \infty$ and $\lambda_e < \infty$ and for any $\hat{\mathbf{r}} = (\hat{r}_1, \hat{r}_2, \dots) \in \ell_\infty$, $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, \dots) \in \ell_\infty$, and $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots)$ with $p_t \in P$, $\forall t$.

On the other hand, from (9), it follows that the output sequence $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots)$ of the system inside the dot-dashed line in Figure 3 is bounded as

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty \leq \lambda_2 \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \quad (27)$$

for any $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots) \in \ell_\infty$ and $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, p_2, \dots)$ with $p_t \in P$, $\forall t$.

According to the Small Gain Theorem, if (26) and (27) hold, and $\lambda_S \lambda_2 < 1$, it follows that the overall closed-loop system in Figure 3 is input-to-state ℓ_∞ stable. This system is equivalent to the system (4), which is thus input-to-state ℓ_∞ stable as well.

(ii) From (23),

$$\begin{aligned} r_{t+1} - x_{t+1} &= r_{t+1} - G^o(p_t) x_t - B(p_t) K_1^o(p_t) r_{t+1} \\ &\quad - H(p_t) e_t + B(p_t) \Delta(p_t) (r_{t+1}, -x_t). \end{aligned}$$

The tracking error is thus bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} TE_{t+1}(\hat{K}) &\leq \|r_{t+1} - G^o(p_t) x_t - B(p_t) K_1^o(p_t) r_{t+1} \\ &\quad - H(p_t) e_t\|_\infty + \lambda_B |\Delta(p_t) (r_{t+1}, -x_t)| \end{aligned}$$

for all $t = 0, 1, \dots$. It follows that the bound (12) holds since, by definition,

$$\begin{aligned} IE(K^o, p_t, r_{t+1}, x_t, e_t) &= \|r_{t+1} - G^o(p_t) x_t \\ &\quad - B(p_t) K_1^o(p_t) r_{t+1} - H(p_t) e_t\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

It is also easy to verify that this bound is tight. Note that tightness is here intended in a worst-case sense: the bound is the tightest one that can be derived on the basis of the available information. ■




Figure 3: Equivalent control system.

Proof of Theorem 2. Let us make use of the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(w) &\equiv \Delta(p, r, x) \doteq \Delta(p)(r, -x) = \Delta_1(p)r - \Delta_2(p)x \\ &= (K_1^o(p) - K_1^*(p))r - (K_2^o(p) - K_2^*(p))x\end{aligned}$$

where $w \doteq (p, r, x) \in \Omega_\Delta \doteq P \times X^2$. For any $p \in P$, $r \in X$ and $x^1, x^2 \in X$, we have that

$$\Delta(p, r, x^1) - \Delta(p, r, x^2) = \Delta_2(p)(x^2 - x^1).$$

From Assumption 2, the data set $\mathcal{D}_{wd}^L$ is dense on $\Omega_\Delta \times \mathcal{B}_\delta$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Then, for any $\nu > 0$, an $L_\nu > 0$ and two points $(\tilde{p}_{i_1}, \tilde{x}_{i_1+1}, \tilde{x}_{i_1}, d_{i_1}), (\tilde{p}_{i_2}, \tilde{x}_{i_2+1}, \tilde{x}_{i_2}, d_{i_2}) \in \mathcal{D}_{wd}^{L_\nu}$ exist such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|x^1 - \tilde{x}_{i_1}\|_\infty &\leq \nu, \quad \|x^2 - \tilde{x}_{i_2}\|_\infty \leq \nu \\ \|p - \tilde{p}_{i_1}\|_\infty &\leq \nu, \quad \|p - \tilde{p}_{i_2}\|_\infty \leq \nu.\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

Note that, for any $\zeta > 0$, ν can be chosen such that $i_2 \in Q_\zeta^{i_1}$. From (9) and (28), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&|\Delta_2(p)(x^2 - x^1)| \\ &= |\Delta_2(p)(x^2 - \tilde{x}_{i_2} + \tilde{x}_{i_2} - x^1 + \tilde{x}_{i_1} - \tilde{x}_{i_1})| \\ &\leq |\Delta_2(p)(\tilde{x}_{i_2} - \tilde{x}_{i_1})| \\ &+ \|\Delta_2(p)\|_\infty (\|x^1 - \tilde{x}_{i_1}\|_\infty + \|x^2 - \tilde{x}_{i_2}\|_\infty) \\ &\leq |\Delta_2(p)(\tilde{x}_{i_2} - \tilde{x}_{i_1})| + 2\lambda_2\nu.\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

Now, consider that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_2(p)(\tilde{x}_{i_2} - \tilde{x}_{i_1}) &= \Delta(\tilde{w}_{i_1}) - \Delta(\tilde{w}_{i_2}) \\ &- \Delta_1(\tilde{p}_{i_1})\tilde{x}_{i_1+1} + \Delta_1(\tilde{p}_{i_2})\tilde{x}_{i_2+1} - \Delta_2(p)\tilde{x}_{i_1} \\ &+ \Delta_2(\tilde{p}_{i_1})\tilde{x}_{i_1} + \Delta_2(p)\tilde{x}_{i_2} - \Delta_2(\tilde{p}_{i_2})\tilde{x}_{i_2}.\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\tilde{w}_{i_1}) - \Delta(\tilde{w}_{i_2}) &= K^o(\tilde{w}_{i_1}) - K^o(\tilde{w}_{i_2}) + K^*(\tilde{w}_{i_2}) \\ &- K^*(\tilde{w}_{i_1}) = \tilde{u}_{i_1} - \tilde{u}_{i_2} + s_{i_2 i_1} + K^*(\tilde{w}_{i_2}) - K^*(\tilde{w}_{i_1}),\end{aligned}$$

where $s_{i_2 i_1} \doteq d_{i_2} - d_{i_1}$, it follows that

$$\Delta_2(p)(\tilde{x}_{i_2} - \tilde{x}_{i_1}) = s_{i_2 i_1}\tag{30}$$

$$+ \tilde{u}_{i_1} - \tilde{u}_{i_2} + K^*(\tilde{w}_{i_2}) - K^*(\tilde{w}_{i_1})\tag{31}$$

$$- \Delta_1(\tilde{p}_{i_1})\tilde{x}_{i_1+1} + \Delta_1(\tilde{p}_{i_2})\tilde{x}_{i_2+1}\tag{32}$$

$$+ \Delta_2(\tilde{p}_{i_1})\tilde{x}_{i_1} - \Delta_2(p)\tilde{x}_{i_1}\tag{33}$$

$$+ \Delta_2(p)\tilde{x}_{i_2} - \Delta_2(\tilde{p}_{i_2})\tilde{x}_{i_2}.\tag{34}$$

Constraints (b) in (17) imply that the term (31) is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}&|\tilde{u}_{i_1} - \tilde{u}_{i_2} + K^*(\tilde{w}_{i_2}) - K^*(\tilde{w}_{i_1})| \\ &= |\tilde{u}_{i_1} - \tilde{u}_{i_2} + (\Psi_{i_2} - \Psi_{i_1})b| \\ &\leq \lambda_2^s \|\tilde{x}_{i_1} - \tilde{x}_{i_2}\|_\infty + 2\delta.\end{aligned}\tag{35}$$

Choosing ν such that $i_2 \in Q_\zeta^{i_1}$, the term (32) is bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Delta_1(\tilde{p}_{i_1})\tilde{x}_{i_1+1} - \Delta_1(\tilde{p}_{i_2})\tilde{x}_{i_2+1}| \\ & \leq \gamma_\Delta \|(\tilde{p}_{i_1}, \tilde{x}_{i_1+1}) - (\tilde{p}_{i_2}, \tilde{x}_{i_2+1})\|_\infty \leq \gamma_\Delta \zeta. \end{aligned}$$

The terms (33) and (34) are bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_2(\tilde{p}_{i_1})\tilde{x}_{i_1} - \Delta_2(p)\tilde{x}_{i_1}| & \leq \gamma_\Delta \|\tilde{p}_{i_1} - p\|_\infty \leq \gamma_\Delta \nu \\ |\Delta_2(\tilde{p}_{i_2})\tilde{x}_{i_2} - \Delta_2(p)\tilde{x}_{i_2}| & \leq \gamma_\Delta \|\tilde{p}_{i_2} - p\|_\infty \leq \gamma_\Delta \nu. \end{aligned}$$

Considering all these bounds, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_2(p)(\tilde{x}_{i_2} - \tilde{x}_{i_1}) & \leq \lambda_2^s \|\tilde{x}_{i_1} - \tilde{x}_{i_2}\|_\infty + 2\delta + s_{i_2 i_1} \\ & \quad + \gamma_\Delta \zeta + 2\gamma_\Delta \nu, \\ \Delta_2(p)(\tilde{x}_{i_2} - \tilde{x}_{i_1}) & \geq -\lambda_2^s \|\tilde{x}_{i_1} - \tilde{x}_{i_2}\|_\infty - 2\delta - s_{i_2 i_1} \\ & \quad - \gamma_\Delta \zeta - 2\gamma_\Delta \nu. \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

The density Assumption 2 implies that an infinite number of couples $(\tilde{x}_{i_1}, \tilde{x}_{i_2})$, $(\tilde{x}_{j_1}, \tilde{x}_{j_2})$, ... satisfying inequalities (36) exist as $L \rightarrow \infty$ and, among these, a couple $(\tilde{x}_{i_1}, \tilde{x}_{i_2})$ exists such that, for any $\mu > 0$, the first of inequalities (36) holds with $s_{i_2 i_1} \leq -2\delta + \mu$. Hence, for this couple,

$$\Delta_2(p)(\tilde{x}_{i_2} - \tilde{x}_{i_1}) \leq \lambda_2^s \|\tilde{x}_{i_1} - \tilde{x}_{i_2}\|_\infty + \mu + \gamma_\Delta \zeta + 2\gamma_\Delta \nu.$$

Using inequalities (28), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_2(p)(\tilde{x}_{i_2} - \tilde{x}_{i_1}) & \leq \lambda_2^s \|x^1 - x^2\|_\infty \\ & \quad + 2\lambda_2^s \nu + \mu + \gamma_\Delta \zeta + 2\gamma_\Delta \nu. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality and (29) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_2(p)(x^2 - x^1) & \leq \lambda_2^s \|x^1 - x^2\|_\infty + 2\lambda_2^s \nu \\ & \quad + \mu + \gamma_\Delta \zeta + 2\gamma_\Delta \nu + 2\lambda_2 \nu. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously, it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_2(p)(x^2 - x^1) & \geq -\lambda_2^s \|x^1 - x^2\|_\infty - 2\lambda_2^s \nu \\ & \quad - \mu - \gamma_\Delta \zeta - 2\gamma_\Delta \nu - 2\lambda_2 \nu \end{aligned}$$

and, consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Delta_2(p)(x^2 - x^1)| & \leq \lambda_2^s \|x^1 - x^2\|_\infty + 2\lambda_2^s \nu \\ & \quad + \mu + \gamma_\Delta \zeta + 2\gamma_\Delta \nu + 2\lambda_2 \nu. \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Now, from the definition of ζ and from the fact that the set $\mathcal{D}_{wd}^L$ is dense, we have that $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \zeta = 0$. Moreover, (37) holds for any $\nu, \mu > 0$. Thus, the inequality

$$|\Delta_2(p)(x^2 - x^1)| \leq \lambda_2^s \|x^1 - x^2\|_\infty$$

holds for any $p \in P$ and any $x^1, x^2 \in X$ as $L \rightarrow \infty$. From (9), we have that

$$|\Delta_2(p)(x^2 - x^1)| \leq \lambda_2 \|x^1 - x^2\|_\infty$$

for any $p \in P$ and any $x^1, x^2 \in X$. Note that, from (9), $\lambda_2 \leq \lambda_2^s \forall L$.

The claim follows comparing these two last inequalities and considering that, in Algorithm 1, λ_2^s is chosen smaller than $1/\lambda_S$. ■

Proof of Theorem 3. (i) If the optimization problem (17) is feasible, then the function K^* defined in (18) exists. Now consider that $K^* = K^* + \Delta$, with $\Delta = 0$. Obviously, if $\Delta = 0$, then $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}(\gamma_\Delta, \Omega_\Delta)$, for any $\gamma_\Delta \geq 0$. Moreover, from (17), $\|\tilde{u} - K^*(\tilde{w})\|_\infty \leq \delta$, implying that $K^* \in FIFS$. This guarantees that

$$\begin{aligned} AE_t(K^*) &= \sup_{K \in FIFS} |K(w_{t-1}) - K^*(w_{t-1})| \\ &\leq 2 \inf_{\hat{K}} \sup_{K \in FIFS} |K(r_t, x_{t-1}) - \hat{K}(r_t, x_{t-1})| \end{aligned}$$

see [7], [3]. Then, the claim follows from the stability condition (11) and the definition of almost-optimal DFK controller. ■

References

- [1] E.W. Bai, H. Cho, and R. Tempo. Convergence properties of the membership set. *Automatica*, 34(10):1245–1249, 1998.
- [2] M. Grant and S. Boyd. CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 1.21. <http://cvxr.com/cvx>, August 2010.
- [3] M. Milanese, J. Norton, H. Piet Lahanier, and E. Walter. *Bounding Approaches to System Identification*. Plenum Press, 1996.
- [4] M. Milanese and C. Novara. Set membership identification of nonlinear systems. *Automatica*, 40/6:957–975, 2004.
- [5] C. Novara, L. Fagiano, and M. Milanese. Direct feedback control design for nonlinear systems. *Automatica*, 49(4):849–860, 2013.
- [6] W.J. Rugh and J.S. Shamma. Research on gain scheduling. *Automatica*, 36:1401–1425, 2000.
- [7] J. F. Traub, G. W. Wasilkowski, and H. Woźniakowski. *Information-Based Complexity*. Academic Press, Inc., 1988.